

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

NICK PEARSON, On Behalf of Himself and All  
Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TARGET CORPORATION, a Minnesota  
Corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 11cv07972

Honorable James B. Zagel

Magistrate Judge Jeffrey T. Gilbert

**DEFENDANT TARGET CORPORATION'S UNOPPOSED MOTION  
FOR LEAVE TO FILE A REPLY BRIEF IN EXCESS OF FIFTEEN PAGES**

Defendant Target Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant"), by and through undersigned counsel, hereby moves for a modest page-limit extension to respond appropriately to the arguments made by Plaintiff in his opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Class Action Complaint. In support of this motion, Defendant states as follows:

1. Pursuant to Court Order, Defendant filed its Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Class Action Complaint on July 20, 2012, and Plaintiff filed his Response on August 31, 2012. Both Defendant and Plaintiff requested, and were granted, modest page-limit extensions to those briefs.

2. Defendant today files its Reply in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Class Action Complaint. Defendant has addressed the arguments in Plaintiff's Response as succinctly as possible, but to address those arguments appropriately, Defendant requests a short, two-page extension to Local Rule 7.1's fifteen-page limit.

3. Plaintiff's counsel has stated that Plaintiff has no objection to this request.

4. Allowance of the additional two pages requested by Defendant herein will not adversely impact any deadlines or prejudice any party (as Plaintiff has confirmed by electing not to oppose this request), but will allow Defendant to respond to Plaintiff's arguments in a manner that Defendant believes will be more informative and helpful to the Court.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Defendant Target Corporation respectfully requests a two-page extension to Local Rule 7.1's fifteen-page limit in order to allow the filing of a seventeen-page Reply in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Class Action Complaint.

Dated: October 18, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bradley J. Andreozzi  
Bradley J. Andreozzi (ARDC No. 6257334)  
[bradley.andreozzi@dbr.com](mailto:bradley.andreozzi@dbr.com)  
Justin O. Kay (ARDC No. 6286557)  
[justin.kay@dbr.com](mailto:justin.kay@dbr.com)  
**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**  
191 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3700  
Chicago, IL 60606-1698  
Tel: (312) 569-1000  
Fax: (312) 569-3000

Kara L. McCall (ARDC No. 6272681)  
[kmccall@sidley.com](mailto:kmccall@sidley.com)  
Shelby K. Feuerbach (ARDC No. 6296364)  
[sfeuerbach@sidley.com](mailto:sfeuerbach@sidley.com)  
**SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP**  
One South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Tel: (312) 853-7000  
Fax: (312) 853-7036

*Counsel for Defendant Target Corporation*